DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 040 843 24 RE 003 047

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Smith, Carl B.; And Others |
| TITLE | Institute for Evaluators of Title I and Title III Reading Programs. |
| INSTITUTION | Indiana Univ., Bloomington. |
| SPONS AGENCY | Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research. |
| BUREAU NO | BR-8-0812 |
| PUB DATE | Aug 68 |
| GRANT | OEG-0-8-980812-4591 |
| NOTE | 27p. |
| EDRS PRICE | EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.45 |
| DESCRIPTORS | Course Evaluation, Course Organization, Evaluation Techniques, Federal Government, *Institutes (Training Programs), *Program Evaluation, *Reading Programs, Summer Institutes |

ABSTRACT

A short term training institute conducted August 12 to August 23, 1968, at Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, is described. Thirteen participants took part in a series of meetings, discussions, and activities related to evaluation problems connected with innovative reading programs funded under Title I and Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The operation, instruction, workshops, objectives, and evaluation of the institute are summarized. Responses by institute participants to an extensive set of followup evaluation questionnaires are also included. (NH)

BR - 8-0812
PA 24

EDO 40843

# Institute for Evaluators of Title I and Title III Reading Programs

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

August 12-23, 1968

Institute Faculty:

Dr. Carl B. Smith
Dr. Roger Farr
Dr. James Laffey

RE 003 047

Funded by the U. S. Office of Education, Bureau of Research

## I. ADMINISTRATION OF THE INSTITUTE

The Institute for Evaluators of Title I and Title III Reading Projects was a short term training institute conducted during August 12 to August 23, 1968. It brought thirteen participants to the Bloomington, Indiana campus of Indiana University for a series of meetings, discussions and activities concerned with the evaluation problems connected with the innovative reading programs funded under Title I and Title III, E.S.E.A. Three members of the faculty from Indiana University developed and carried out the program and four guest speakers contributed their specific insights. This report briefly summarizes the operation, instruction, workshops, objectives and evaluation of the institute.

### SETTING UP THE INSTITUTE

A chronological narrative of the operation of the institute will probably be most useful here because the very late funding of the institute required a deviation from the normal procedures of advertising for and selecting participants.

Due to considerable budget problems in Washington, the training institute was not approved until July 1, 1968, and we were instructed not to advertise until a contract had been signed. We then sent out a letter to 425 school systems in a six state region asking them if they had anyone interested in attending such an institute from August 12-23, should it be funded. We received 14 applications and 6 telephone calls. The callers wanted to inform us that such a training institute was needed but they could not free anyone at such a late notice. They wanted to come later, should we hold another training program next spring.

The institute faculty then called fifteen cities to see if they would send participants. An additional nine names were added to the list of potential participants. July 15 had arrived by this time, and the staff requested a postponement of the institute. The Bureau of Research recommended, however, that the institute be held on the original dates using the 23 participants whose names we had. Letters of acceptance were then mailed to all those who had indicated an interest. Several called to excuse themselves because they could not get free afterall; one representative from Chicago started for the institute site but became ill enroute. Thirteen reported and participated.

The only large city represented in the group of participants was Indianapolis, Indiana. But telephone calls from the following cities indicated their desire to participate in the spring of 1969: Cleveland, Columbus, Chicago, San Diego, Philadelphia, Oakland, Buffalo. The Research Council of the Great Cities Program also wanted to encourage its member cities to participate next year if the institute is duplicated. One applicant was on the staff of an evaluation center of a university. The university had a contract with a large city to conduct its evaluation of a Title I reading program and wanted to send the evaluator to our training institute to learn about the variables in reading and the instruments used to measure them.

Facilities

Participants were housed in a new hotel one block from the campus. One camped with his family in a nearby state park; another chose a motel where his family had some playground space. Everyone reported that they were satisfied with their accommodations.

All morning sessions were held in an air-conditioned conference room in the student union building. Afternoon sessions were held at various locations, depending on the kind of activity. Most of the afternoon sessions were held in Pine Hall, the home of the reading program, ERIC/CRIER, test file and reading library. Other p.m. sessions were held in the computer center, the reading clinic and the library of the school of education.

Cooperation of Participants

Since all participants who applied were accepted, there was no opportunity to screen them through the use of value criteria. (And perhaps this is good for we got people who desperately needed this kind of training.) It might have been possible to have gathered a group that could have contributed more from their own experience had they had some background in measurement and evaluation. Generally though, the participants worked hard in producing the assignments listed in another section of this report. Only one person ended the two weeks without submitting some work on a taxonomy of evaluation techniques, an outline guide for one of the workshops.

The staff was quite pleased with the cooperation and the response of the participants. There was a favorable balance between lecture-type activities and workshop type.

Staff and Guest Lecturers

Staff responsibilities were divided as follows: Dr. Roger Farr was full time in instruction; Dr. James Laffey was 25% time in instruction (information resources); Dr. Carl Smith was 50% time administration and 50% instruction. Guest lecturers gave four presentations on the following subjects:

1. International Reading Association and Evaluation
   by Dr. Leo C. Fay, President of I.R.A.

2. Unified Data Collection System for Title I
   by Dr. Richard Jaeger, Director of Title I Evaluation,
   U. S. O. E.

3. Reading Tests, Their Norms and Their Construction
   by Dr. Roger Lennon, Director of Test Division,
   Harcourt, Brace and World

4. Classroom and Informal Evaluation of Reading
   by Dr. John Connelly, Director Reading Clinic, Fredonia
   New York University

The combination of staff and guests enabled a variety of presentations and offered the participants the choice of two offerings on some afternoons.

## PRODUCTS OF THE INSTITUTE

Several useful products were developed as part of the institute activity. Participants were encouraged to prepare an evaluation design for their current project and to discuss it with one of the staff members. Seven of the thirteen participants presented new designs to the staff for criticism. Each of the participants also reviewed in detail one of the many standardized reading tests. These reviews will be duplicated and made available to all the members of the institute.

The participants also worked on sections of a taxonomy of evaluation instruments and techniques. Each selected one part of the grid, a copy of which is enclosed, and located tests or prepared evaluation instruments. The staff had done preliminary work on the taxonomy and had made available check sheets, questionnaires, test and criteria that had been gathered as part of the preliminary

version of the taxonomy. The compilation of the work of the staff and the participants will be typed and duplicated and distributed to all the participants. Since it involves about 200 pages of material, it will require several weeks of typing, printing and collating. As soon as it is ready, a copy will be sent to the U.S.O.E. The duplicated test reviews will likewise be sent at a later date.

It seems likely that this taxonomy could serve other evaluator training institutes and could serve as a kickoff for other materials that would be useful to the evaluators who attended the institute. (See recommendations for suggested materials for future institutes.

## II. PROGRAM SCHEDULE AND DESCRIPTION

Monday, August 12

9:00-10:00 a.m.

Introductions
Overview of institute
Location of facilities--test bureau, reading test files, ERIC/CRIER facilities, education reading room, University library, etc.
Question and answer

10:00-11:30 a.m.

"The IRA and Evaluation"--Dr. Leo Fay, President, International Reading Association

1:00-2:00 p.m.

Pre-test on research design, measurement and evaluation: this test was used as an indication of participants' strengths and weaknesses in the areas of measurement and evaluation. A reading list was keyed to areas on the exam where students needed extra review.

2:00-3:00 p.m.

Outline for evaluating reading test: this outline covered the mechanical and logical evaluation of a test. Included in the discussion were such things as the value and use of norms, the interpretation of reliability and validity evidence, and a logical evaluation of sub-tests and items.

3:00-4:00 p.m.

Administrative details

Tuesday, August 13

9:00-10:00 a.m.

Review of basic concepts of measurement and evaluation: this discussion was geared to weaknesses identified on the pre-test. In all cases the discussion of technical considerations of tests and measurement were focused on the problems of measuring reading behavior.

11:00-11:45 a.m.

Outline for evaluating reading test: this was a continuation of discussion of the test outline. Some students were better prepared for this discussion after the review of basic measurement concepts.

1:00-4:00 p.m.

Workshop on reviewing tests: ERIC/CRIER, Institute for Child Study and School of Education facilities will be available.

Wednesday, August 14

9:00-12:00 a.m.

Evaluation models
CIPP; Ed. and Psych. Measurement models; Title I model; Title III model: the focus of this discussion was the use of models to evaluation designs of local programs. Examples of various evaluation reports were used to point out problem areas and to indicate how the evaluation models could be used to improve the evaluation of the projects.

1:00-4:00 p.m.

Workshop on review of proposals and evaluation of tests. Participants reviewed samples of Title I and Title III proposals. Several participants began the development of evaluation designs for their local projects.

Thursday, August 15

9:00-11:00 a.m.

Objectives: This session focused on the writing of "operational" objectives. This was then keyed to evaluation designs.

11:00-12:00 a.m.

What is reading: (defined through measurement): The various levels of reading and approaches to measurement were discussed. Research studies dealing with the definition of reading as determined by factor analysis and other techniques were also discussed.

1:00-2:00 p.m.

Ways of collecting data: Questionnaires, check sheets, interaction analysis, and other unobtrusive measures were reviewed.

2:00-4:00 p.m.

Discussion of evaluation taxonomy and assignment of workshop activity: This session focused on a discussion of the taxonomy design for evaluating various aspects of a reading program.

Friday, August 16

9:00-9:45 a.m.

Information resources on reading: A wide range of research review sources and materials were discussed and evaluated.

10:00-11:30 a.m.

"National Evaluation of Title I"--Dr. Richard Jaeger, U.S.O.E.

11:45 a.m.

Lunch with Dr. Jaeger

1:00-4:00 p.m.

Workshop on taxonomy: Continuation of the workshop begun on Thursday.

Monday, August 19

9:00-11:00 a.m.

ERIC and ERIC/CRIER: The goal of this session was to acquaint the participants with the possible uses of ERIC/CRIER as an aid in securing information on reading programs.

11:00-12:00 a.m.

Evaluation of teachers: Interaction analysis techniques as an aid in teacher evaluation were explained, demonstrated, and discussed.

1:00-4:00 p.m.

Taxonomy workshop.

Tuesday, August 20

9:00-10:30 a.m.

Measuring change: The problems and techniques of determining whether growth has taken place were reviewed and discussed. Residual gain scores were explained as well as other procedures

for removing regression effects, the Hawthorne effect, and the effects of practice.

10:45-12:00 a.m.

Evaluation of materials: Methods of determining the usefulness and effectiveness of materials were discussed. Readability formulas were considered as one aspect of the evaluation of materials.

1:00-3:00 p.m.

Research design: A review of basic techniques in setting up control-experimental type evaluations.

3:00-4:00 p.m.

Taxonomy workshop.

Wednesday, August 21

9:00-9:45 a.m.

Evaluating teachers: The broad problems of establishing criteria for determining teacher effectiveness were discussed. Specific procedures for conducting teacher evaluations were reviewed.

10:00-11:45 a.m.

"Tests and Evaluation"--Dr. Roger Lennon, Director of Test Division, Harcourt, Brace and World--Dr. Lennon discussed problems of standardized tests in making evaluations. A discussion of Title I questions received by Harcourt, Brace and World was included.

11:45 a.m.

Lunch with Dr. Lennon.

1:00-4:00 p.m.

Taxonomy workshop.

Thursday, August 22

9:00-11:00 a.m.

Measurement and types of reading programs: Measurement and evaluation procedures for developmental, corrective, and clinic type programs were discussed and various measurement devices were demonstrated.

11:00-12:00 a.m.

"Information Retrieval"--Dr. Edward Summers, ERIC/CRIER

1:00-4:00 p.m.

Using canned computer programs for evaluation: Interested participants were taken on a tour of the Indiana University computer facilities. Applications of computer techniques to evaluation of school programs were discussed.

Friday, August 23

9:00-10:00 a.m.

"Measurement in the Classroom"--Dr. John Connelly, Director Reading Clinic, State University of New York at Fredonia. Evaluation techniques used on an informal classroom level were demonstrated.

10:00-11:00 a.m.

Problems in measuring specific reading skills: The problems and methods of measuring specific sub-skills of reading were reviewed. Instruments for measuring specific skills were demonstrated.

1:00-4:00 p.m.

Review of taxonomy activities and review of collection of evaluation instruments.

Evaluation of institute.

Workshops

There were three separate workshop activities; institute participants were invited to share in all of them or to concentrate on one activity if they desired.

1. Evaluation of standardized tests: Participants used specimen sets of various reading tests to evaluate all aspects of the tests. The A.P.A. Guidelines were used as a criteria base. Staff members were available to discuss specific technial problems such as validity, reliability or norming.

2. Development of evaluation design: Participants reviewed evaluation designs from sample Title I and Title III reports which were available. Several participants then went on to develop evaluation designs for their local situations. Staff members were available to assist in the development of these designs.

3. Development of taxonomy: Prior to the institute, the staff members developed the concept for, and the outline of, a taxonomy of evaluation devices that could be used to assess various aspects of a reading program. The participants collected and developed a wide variety of instruments that could be used for evaluation purposes within the framework of the taxonomy.

## III. EVALUATION AND OBJECTIVES

To evaluate the institute the directors (1) interviewed the participants to determine whether or not they (participants) thought the objectives of the institute had been attained, (2) obtained written responses from the participants to determine the effectiveness of various aspects of the institute and (3) listed the products developed by the institute participants.

During the interview conducted with each participant the following list of objectives were presented and the participants were asked whether or not he (she) thought the objectives had been attained.

Objectives of the Institute

As a result of participating in this institute, the evaluators will be able to:

1. Isolate and define significant variables relative to a reading program.
2. Use a variety of resources for gathering information about reading programs on a local, state and national level.
3. Develop criteria for evaluating significant factors in reading programs.
4. Select, develop and use a variety of methods for evaluating the variables related to a reading program.
5. Discuss and develop models for evaluating a reading program.

The results of the interviews with a number of the participants are listed below. The graph indicates how the participants responded to the question concerning the objectives of the institute.

Approximate percentages are used for ease of interpretation.

| | Objectives Attained | Objectives Not Attained |
|---|---|---|
| Objective #1 | 40% | 60% |
| Objective #2 | 100% | 0 |
| Objective #3 | 100% | 0 |
| Objective #4 | 60% | 40% |
| Objective #5 | 100% | 0 |
| *Overall Success | 100% | |

From the personal interviews, the directors found that while the majority of the participants felt that the institute was highly successful, they (the participants) did indicate that more time should have been spent (1) isolating significant variables related to a reading program and (2) selecting and developing a variety of methods for evaluating the variables related to a reading program. To some extent, the products developed by the participants will aid the participants in dealing with the problem areas they identified in the interview.

As a second aspect of the evaluation conducted by the directors of the institute, the participants were asked to respond in writing to the following open ended statements: (1) The institute had too much...., (2) The institute had too little...., (3) The faculty was...., (4) Specific concepts presented by the faculty were...., (5) I gained these specific values...., and (6) As an evaluator I now.... These questions were designed to provide the institute

*The participants also were asked whether or not they thought the institute was an overall success.

directors with information concerning the content and organization of the institute, the effectiveness of the faculty, and knowledge gained by the participants.

The following information was taken from the participants' responses to the open ended statements. Approximately seventy per cent of the participants felt that the institute was very well balanced. (Organization and content). One illustrative statement concerning the institute was, "The balance was good. We each should come out with those things needed most." Regarding the second open ended question (the institute had too little...) approximately fifteen per cent of the participants felt that more time should have been devoted to developing the participants' background knowledge in the basic concepts in the area of measurement and evaluation. Possibly this information will be valuable to the institute directors in developing criteria for selecting participants in the future. In responding to the third open ended question (the faculty was...) one hundred per cent of the participants felt the faculty was very good. Some statements made by the participants were: (1) "The balance of the faculty team was good." (2) "The faculty was great." (3)"The faculty was a very pleasant balance. I appreciated each one and the things they had to offer." (4) "The faculty was very helpful, knowledgable, eager to assist, and exuded a sense of committment to this area and the institute." In response to the fourth open ended question (specific concepts presented by the faculty...) the participants responded in the following manner. Approximately seventy per cent felt that the concepts were presented very well and in proper depth. Ten per cent felt that the concepts were not presented in enough detail or depth.

Approximately fifteen per cent felt that the concepts were not explained thoroughly enough to see their practical application. In responding to the fifth open ended question (I gained these specific values...) each participant mentioned a minimum of two specific values gained from the institute and a majority (60%) mentioned a minimum of four specific values gained from the institute. Examples of the values gained in the institute as stated by the participants were: (1) "How to formulate clear meaningful objectives," (2) "Recognize the limits of standardized tests", (3) "Increased respect for observational techniques of evaluation", (4) "Knowledge of resources in reading," (6) Guidelines or models for evaluating reading programs" and (7) Pool of sample checklists for use in future evaluations." Examples of responses to the fifth open ended question which were not as specific were as follows. (1) "As an evaluator, I now feel more secure in carrying out my duties and I also realize I have much more to learn," (2) "As an evaluator, I now feel more prepared but also more cautious in the absolute. I feel I can be a little more realistic in the capacity of an evaluator." In response to the sixth open ended question, participants expressed their views of the institute being valuable for them generally because of the additional skills, knowledge, and tools they will be able to utilize in their positions as evaluators.

The following products were produced during the institute: (1) evaluations of twenty standardized reading tests, and (2) a preliminary edition of a taxonomy for reading program evaluation.

## SUMMARY

From the information obtained from the participants concerning the objectives, organization, content, and faculty of the institute for evaluators, the directors feel that it was a highly successful institute. In addition, the highly useful products developed in the institute will continue to assist the evaluators in better performing their tasks on the job. An additional follow-up questionnaire will be sent to the evaluators in November as a follow-up of this initial evaluation.

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE

To Participants of Evaluator's Institute for Title I

and Title III Reading Programs

August 12-23, 1968

On January 10, 1969, a follow-up questionnaire was sent to each of the participants in the Summer Institute for Evaluators of Title I and Title III Reading Programs, August 12-23, 1968. The purpose of this questionnaire was to get a reflection of how the participants saw their knowledge and their ability to apply what they learned in the Institute.

All of the responses that were received are recorded in a composite of the questionnaires attached below. Each of the items listed in the questionnaire concerning both application and knowledge of the evaluation concepts were those specifically treated in the Evaluation Institute.

For the most part, the participants seemed to feel that they had achieved a fair familiarity with the concepts and topics listed in this questionnaire. They further indicated that generally they had either used or intend to use in their present situation what they learned. The items listed in this questionnaire are not intended to be equal in every sense. Some of these concepts were presented in depth and others were simply mentioned as part of the body of knowledge that an evaluator might have. Thus, in the questionnaire referring to knowledge presented during the Institute, some 50% of the participants responded that they were not familiar with "unobtrusive measures." "Unobtrusive measures" were mentioned very briefly as a kind of measure that is discussed in evaluation circles and two or three examples were given. It was not treated in any kind of depth.

Of greater concern is the fact that the participants did not seem to be

very familiar or not familiar at all with the C.I.P.P. model for evaluation. This was treated at some length and it was anticipated that they would be able to respond to that content. It may be that simply putting the initials C.I.P.P. in the questionnaire did not offer a sufficient clue or stimulus to remind them what we were talking about.

As was reported in the general discussion of the Institute, we were aware that not enough time had been spent on identifying specific areas of reading that should be considered when evaluating a reading program. Many of the evaluators were not reading specialists and therefore were not able to identify all the variables associated with the reading program. It is possible to go through the various topics that are listed here and identify the things that should be stressed in future evaluation institutes and those things that should be expanded or explained more. One of those areas that should be expanded is the measuring of specific reading skills and another is different kinds of measurements for different kinds of reading programs.

Another area the participants felt should be expanded beyond what was contained in the first Institute was a discussion and a development of the models for evaluating specific reading programs. This may seem like a request for a cookbook approach to their own reading program and that, of course, is the desire of many of the people who came to the Institute, but it also reflects the need of these participants to work through several different models and to actually try to develop evaluation models before being sent back to do that kind of work on the job.

In summary, it appears that the Institute participants felt that they retained some valuable knowledge and were applying it or intended to apply it as situations arose. There seemed to be a feeling that there was a generally good balance and that the topics treated served them well. Exceptions were noted in the previous paragraphs.

Best Available

Composite of Follow-Up Questionnaire

Responses

EVALUATORS TRAINING INSTITUTE

Follow-up Questionnaire

Directions: Please fill in the blanks and help up take a second look at the Institute for Evaluators of reading programs.

I. Name _____

Present Job Title _____

Briefly describe your present duties _____

_____

_____

_____

School or School District in Which You Are Now Employed _____

_____

Student Enrollment _____ Faculty (Number) _____

School Address _____ Grade Levels _____

II. Evaluation Institute
(Knowledge)

The following list of questions is an attempt to determine how knowledgeable you feel concerning some of the information discussed during the institute. Place a check mark in the appropriate column concerning your knowledge of the concepts, topics, or names listed. (1) If you feel very knowledgeable and could discuss the concept, topic, or name place a check mark in the first column. (2) If you do not feel you could discuss the concept, topic, or name in depth but you are familiar with it, place a check mark in the second column. (3) If you feel that you are unable to either discuss the concept, topic, or name, or are not familiar with it at all, place a check mark in the last column.

| Concept, Topic, or Name | Not Familiar | Familiar | Very Familiar |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I.R.A. | | 5 | 8 |
| 2. Evaluation | | 3 | 10 |
| 3. Measurement | | 7 | 6 |
| 4. Reliability | | 9 | 4 |
| 5. Regression Effect | 3 | 6 | 4 |
| 6. Hawthorne Effect | 1 | 5 | 7 |
| 7. C.I.P.P. | 5 | 6 | 3 |
| 8. Behavioral Objectives | 2 | 5 | 5 |
| 9. Title I Model for Evaluation | 1 | 10 | 2 |
| 10. Factor Analysis | 2 | 10 | 1 |
| 11. Data Collecting | 1 | 8 | 4 |
| 12. Interaction Analysis | 3 | 7 | 3 |
| 13. Unobtrusive Measure | 6 | 4 | 2 |
| 14. ERIC | | 8 | 5 |
| 15. Title Three Evaluation Model | 4 | 7 | 1 |

| Concept, Topic, or Name | Not Familiar | Familiar | Very Familiar |
|---|---|---|---|
| 16. Residual Gain Scores | 2 | 9 | 2 |
| 17. Readability formulas | | 9 | 5 |
| 18. Practice Effect | 4 | 4 | 5 |
| 19. Control Group | | 5 | 7 |
| 20. Canned Computer Program | 4 | 6 | 2 |
| 21. ERIC/CRIER | | 7 | 6 |
| 22. Taxonomy | | 5 | 8 |
| 23. Measuring Change | 2 | 6 | 5 |
| 24. Define Reading through Measurement | 1 | 5 | 6 |
| 25. Buros | | 3 | 10 |
| 26. Austin, Mary, Bush, C.T. and Heubner, M.H. | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| 27. Handbook of Research on Education | 2 | 9 | 2 |

III. Evaluation Institute
(Practical Application)

The following items refer to things that you may have applied. Check the column that best describes your use of each item since the Institute.

| | Do not understand well enough to use | Have not used it because it is not a valuable tool | Intend to use when opportunity arises | Have used once | Have used more than once |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Taxonomy of Evaluation Techniques for Reading | | 1 | 6 | 1 | 4 |
| 2. Evaluations of Reading Tests | | | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| 3. Evaluation Model (CIPP or Title I or Title III) | 1 | | 8 | 1 | 1 |
| 4. Principles of Test Validity and Reliability | 2 | | 4 | | 6 |
| 5. Model for evaluating reading teachers (interaction analysis) | 1 | | 9 | | 2 |
| 6. Model for evaluating reading materials | | | 6 | 1 | 5 |
| 7. Outline for writing performance objectives | 1 | | 9 | 1 | 1 |
| 8. Outline of data collection methods | 2 | | 8 | | 2 |
| 9. ERIC/CRIER | | | 7 | 1 | 4 |
| 10. Principles for the measurement of change | 1 | | 6 | | 5 |
| 11. Ways of measuring specific reading skills | 1 | | 3 | | 8 |
| 12. NSSE Yearbook on Reading, 1968 | 1 | | 6 | 1 | 3 |
| 13. IRA publications on evaluation | | | 5 | | 7 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14. Canned Computer Programs | 6 | 1 | 4 | 1 | |
| 15. Procedures for developing local norms | 1 | | 9 | 1 | 1 |
| 16. Buros' Mental Measurement Yearbook | | | 3 | 3 | 6 |

IV. EVALUATION INSTITUTE
(Recommendations)

A. Subject matter content of the institute. Place a check in the appropriate column regarding your opinion of the weight given to the following course content areas.

| | Satisfactory | Should be explained | Should be shortened. | Not needed | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Basic concepts in measurement and evaluation | 9 | 3 | | | |
| 2. Evaluation of reading tests | 9 | 1 | 2 | | |
| 3. Definition of reading through measurement | 9 | 3 | | 1 | |
| 4. Ways of collecting data | 9 | 2 | | | |
| 5. Information resources on reading | 10 | | | 1 | |
| 6. ERIC and ERIC/CRIER | 11 | 1 | | | |
| 7. Evaluation of Teachers | 8 | 2 | | 1 | |
| 8. Measuring change | 7 | 4 | | | |
| 9. Evaluation of materials | 7 | 4 | | | |
| 10. Measurement in various types of reading programs | 5 | 7 | | | |
| 11. Problems in measuring specific skills | 3 | 9 | | | |

B. Course objectives. Place a check in the appropriate column regarding your estimate of the course objectives.

| Institute participants should be able to: | Quite Important | Should be Expanded | Should be Deleted |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. isolate and define the significant variables related to a reading program. | 10 | 3 | |
| 2. use a variety of resources for gathering information about reading programs on a local, state, and national level. | 7 | 3 | 1 |
| 3. Develop criteria for evaluating significant factors in reading programs | 9 | 4 | |
| 4. select, develop and use a variety of methods for evaluating the variables related to a reading programs. | 8 | 5 | |
| 5. discuss and develop models for evaluating reading programs. | 7 | 6 | |

6. Additional objectives: (List others that you feel are very important)

_____

_____

_____

_____

C. Activities (Assignments) Check the appropriate column regarding your opinion of the value of the institute assignments:

| | Should be Continued | Should be Broadened | Should be Dropped |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. Development of taxonomy | 8 | 3 | 1 |
| b. Evaluation of reading tests | 11 | 1 | |
| c. Informal seminars | 8 | 3 | 1 |
| d. Outside readings | 9 | 3 | |
| e. Formal lectures | 9 | 2 | |
| f. Examination of Title I and Title III reports | 6 | 6 | |

D. Institute Personnel: Check the appropriate column regarding the competencies of the Institute Staff.

| | Very high | Average | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. Knowledge in appropriate areas | 11 | | |
| b. Interest in participants | 10 | 1 | |
| c. Ability to clarify confusing concepts | 9 | 3 | |
| d. Appreciation of students' point of view | 11 | | |
| e. Ability and willingness to answer relevant questions | 11 | | |

E. General Suggestions for Future Institutes:

Thank you for your assistance.

R. Farr

J. Laffey

C. Smith

1968